

### **REMARKS/ARGUMENTS**

In this proposed after-final amendment, claim 88 is amended, and claims 48-66, 86, 89, 95-99, and 101 are canceled without prejudice, leaving claims 1-5, 7-12, 14, 15, 17-27, 39-46, 68-78, 83, 87, 88, 100, 102, and 103 pending in the application. (Claims 6, 13, 16, 28-38, 47, 67, 79-82, 84, 85, and 90-94 were previously canceled.) Applicant respectfully requests that this amendment be entered and the application reexamined and reconsidered.

This proposed amendment should be entered because it clearly places the application in condition for allowance. In the final Office Action, the Examiner indicated that claims 1-5, 7-12, 14, 15, 17-27, 39-46, 65-78 [sic: 68-78?], 83, 100, 102, and 103 are allowed and claim 88 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form to include the base claim and any intervening claim. Claim 88 has been so rewritten. Thus, all of the claims that would remain pending following entry of this amendment were identified by the Examiner as allowable or as containing allowable subject matter except for claim 87. Claim 87, however, depends from claim 78, which was identified as allowable by the Examiner. Claim 87 should therefore also be allowable. Thus, all of the claims that would remain in the application following entry of this amendment are clearly allowable.

Claim 95 was objected to on the grounds that the words "member means" are incorrect. Claim 95 is canceled, mooting this objection.

Claims 48-66, 95-99, and 101 were rejected under 35 USC § 112, 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph, and claims 95-99 and 101 were further rejected under 35 USC § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. In addition, claims 86, 87, 89, 95, 96, 98, 99, and 101 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as obvious in view of US Patent No. 4,811,246 to Fitzgerald, Jr. et al., and claim 97 was rejected as obvious in view of Fitzgerald and US Patent No. 4,370,011 to Suzuki et al.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of claim 87. As mentioned above, claim 87 depends from claim 78, which was identified by the Examiner as allowable in the Office Action dated December 4, 2003. Because 78 is allowable, claim 87 should also be allowable. Therefore, Applicant requests that the rejection of claim 87 be withdrawn.

Without agreeing with the various rejections of claims 48-66, 86, 89, 95-99, and 101, Applicant cancels these claims, mooting all of the rejections of these claims. Applicant cancels claims 48-66, 86, 89, 95-99, and 101 solely for the purpose of advancing this application to


issue. Applicant intends to bring claims 48-66, 86, 89, 95-99, and 101 in a continuation application in which Applicant will traverse all of the foregoing rejections of these claims.

As a final comment, Applicant traverses the statement in the Office Action that the term "reverse wipe" is limited in the specification to back and forth wiping. On pages 15 and 16 of the specification, "forward wipe" in a first direction is described and illustrated in Figure 4B, and "reverse wipe" in a different direction is described and illustrated in Figure 4C. (See, e.g., specification page 15, line 25 and page 16, line 7.) Therefore, the term "reverse wipe," as used in the specification, may encompass single direction wipe.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant submits that all of the claims are allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that a discussion with Applicant's attorney would be helpful, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (801) 536-6763.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 4, 2004

By   
N. Kenneth Burraston  
Reg. No. 39,923

Parsons, Behle & Latimer PLC  
P.O. Box 45898  
201 South Main St., Suite 1800  
Salt Lake City, Utah 84145-0898  
Phone: (801) 536-6763  
Fax: (801) 536-6111